

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 7, and 8 have been canceled. Claim 4 and amended claims 1, 5, and 6 are in the present application.

Claims 1 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Igarashi et al. (5,940,143).

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

phase locking means for attaining phase locking to said interference signal of said peak level;

level adjusting means for adjusting a level of a phase-locked signal that is output from the phase locking means to be equal to a level of said interference signal; and

subtracting means for subtracting the level-adjusted, phase-locked signal from the reception signal of said reception means.
(Emphasis added.)

In explaining the above 102 rejection with regard to claim 1, the Examiner asserted that PLL 130 and lines 18-22 of column 5 and lines 7-15 of column 6 of Igarashi disclose the phase locking means of claim 1; that IFAGC-100 and line 53 of column 7 to line 6 of column 8, lines 7-67 of column 8, and line 60 of column 10 to line 52 of column 11 of Igarashi disclose the level adjusting means of claim 1; and that AGC detector 200 and lines 31-63 of column 7 of Igarashi disclose the subtracting means of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Igarashi do not specifically disclose the above features of claim 1 for at least the reasons described below.

The phase locking means of claim 1 may attain "phase locking to said interference signal of said peak level." On the other hand, PLL 130 of Igarashi appears to perform oscillation a "at a frequency corresponding to a desired channel." (See lines

8-9 of column 6 of Igarashi.) Thus, the PLL 130 of Igarashi does not appear to be locked to an interference signal.

The level adjusting means of claim 1 may adjust "a level of a phase-locked signal that is output from the phase locking means to be equal to a level of said interference signal." On the other hand, in Igarashi, the IFAGC-100 does not appear to adjust an output from the PLL 130 to a level of an interference signal.

The subtracting means of claim 1 may subtract "the level-adjusted, phase-locked signal from the reception signal." On the other hand, in Igarashi, the AGC detector 200 does not appear to subtract a level adjusted signal from the reception signal. In explaining the rejection of claim 1 as mentioned above, the Examiner asserted that the IFAGC-100 was the same as the level adjusting means of claim 1 and that the AGC detector 200 was the same as the subtracting means of claim 1. Accordingly, in the Examiner's arrangement, the AGC detector 200 should receive an output (or level-adjusted phase-locked signal) from the IFAGC-100 and subtract it from the reception signal. However, the AGC detector 200 appears to receive a signal from IFAGC-100 and detect a resultant signal. (See, for example, lines 31-33 of column 7 of Igarashi.) The IFAGC-100 does not appear to subtract the signal receive from the IFAGC-100 from the reception signal.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner. For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to independent claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 5 is also distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner.

Claims 4 and 6 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that that dependent claims 4 and 6 are also distinguishable from

Igarashi as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described with regard to claims 1 and 5.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephones applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 25, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid

Registration No.: 34,930
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant